UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/873,712	06/04/2001	Lanny Gilbert	36968/248471	6729

36192   7590   05/06/2004

CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH
BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002

EXAMINER
GEREZGIHER, YEMANE M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2144	

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 June 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>09 July 2001</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This application has been examined. Claims 1-32 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 1, 3-12, 16, 17, 20-27 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being anticipated by Hegli et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,606,659) hereinafter referred to

as Hegli.

As per claim 1, Hegli disclosed *(a) an access control mechanism for providing*

temporary access information based on visitor information. See ABSTRACT, Column 1,

Line 62 through Column 2, Line 61, Hegli disclosed a system and method for controlling

access to web sites based on a visitors/users record information activities by allowing a

limited access to the resources for a limited period of time, *(b) a database having a*

plurality of entries, each entry is an access record assigned to one visitor which

contains the temporary access information. See ABSTRACT, Figure 9, Column 1, Line

62 through Column 2, Line 61, *and (c) a server control engine for receiving temporary*

access requests from the visitors for analyzing the temporary access information stored

in the database, and for granting temporary access permissions if the visitors have not

exceeded an access limit, was taught by Hegli. See Figures 5, 11 and 13, Column 17,

Lines 43-67 and Column 18, Line 54 through Column 19, Line 21, Hegli disclosed

receiving a request from the visitor/user to access information from the server, where

the server calculated/compared the amount of access the visitor/user had against the

given limited quota of access and granting temporary access based on a preset limited

access amount.

As per claim 3, Hegli disclosed a timer module keeping track of a controlled

access to the sites by using a time stamp indicating a start time of access to the web

site resources and end point of allowed access by comparing a current time spent in

accessing the site against the allowed time. See Column 17, Lines 43-67.

As per claims 4-8, Hegli disclosed an access record of a user comprising a

number of accesses and number of requests where the number of accesses and the

number of requests where read and compared against the limited preset access quota.

See Figures 11-13, Column 17, Line 43 through Column19, Line 21.

As per claim 9, Hegli disclosed an access record comprising a user identification

code. See Figure 9 and Column 17, Lines 36-38. Hegli disclosed a timer monitoring

user's access amount and assigning the timer to the requesting user's access, setting a

new timer (See Figure 11, step 868) for new user and *incrementing access number*

when a user access the site/page according to a preset limit (claims 10 and 11). See

Figures 4, 11 and 13.

As per claim 12, *(a) receiving a request from a visitor to access the site,* See

Figure 5 (Hegli disclosed a user/visitor requesting access to a site) Column 7, Lines 27-

29, Hegli disclosed receiving a request from a client visitor *(b) identifying the visitor,* See

Figure 9, Hegli disclosed identifying the visitor/user by reading user ID from a cookie

found in a client side and (c) *creating an access record for the visitor which identifies the*

visitor when the cookie was not found at the client machine by generating a unique user

ID (See Figure 9) *and an amount the visitor has accessed the site,* was taught by Hegli.

See Figure 13 (where the counter (number of access) to the page was incremented by

one and stored in the database and (d) *checking the amount stored in the access*

record against a preset access limit; and granting access to the visitor if the amount

stored in access record does not exceed the preset access limit, See Figures 11 and

13, Column 17, Lines 43-67 and Column 18, Line 54 through Column 19, Line 21. Hegli

disclosed where the server calculated/compared the amount of access the visitor/user

had against the given limited quota of access and granting temporary access while the

amount of access by the user was under the threshold. Hegli taught logging a received

request from the user and incrementing the counter (claims 16,17, 22 and 23). See

Figure 12, Step 914 and Column 18, Lines 22-53.

As per claim 20, *(a) receiving a request from a visitor seeking access to the web*

site, was taught by Hegli. See Figure 5 (disclosed a user/visitor requesting access to a

site) Column 7, Lines 27-29, Hegli disclosed receiving a request from a *(b) identifying*

the visitor, See Figure 9, Hegli disclosed identifying the visitor/user by reading user ID

from a cookie found in a client side and *(c) creating an access record for the visitor*

when the cookie was not found at the client machine by generating a unique user ID

(See Figure 9) *reflecting an amount the visitor has accessed the web site,* was taught

by Hegli. See Column, Lines, Hegli disclosed *(d) setting an access allowance limit for*

the visitor, was taught by Hegli. See Column, Lines, Hegli disclosed *(e) checking the*

amount stored in the; access record against the access allowance limit, and (f)

permitting access to the web site until the amount in the access record equals the

access allowance limit, See Figures 11 and 13, Column 17, Lines 43-67 and Column

18, Line 54 through Column 19, Line 21. Hegli disclosed where the server comparing

the amount of access the visitor/user had against the preset quota of access and

granting temporary access while the amount of access by the user was under preset

quota.

As per claim 21, Hegli disclosed generating an access code. See Figure 9, Steps

726 and 716. Since the teachings of Hegli was performed in a client-server environment

obtaining an IP address from the visitor was inherently disclosed, the server must have

obtained an IP address of the requesting client in order to identify the requesting client

device uniquely.

As per claim 24, Hegli disclosed setting a number of accesses. See Column 18,

Lines 1-21, "the management of a business could set, for example, a 15-minute quota

for sites within the Sports category, and a 1-hour time limit per day for sites within the

Internet Commerce category and Column 19, Lines 1-3, "For example, a quota

parameter might be that the user is allowed 10, 20, 30, 40, 50 or more accesses to a

site within the chosen category in any 24-hour period").

As per claim 25, *wherein the access record has an access counter and the method*

further comprises incrementing the access, counter for each login from the visitor. See

Figures 11 and 13, Column 19, Lines 10-15, Hegli disclosed a counter which was

incremented by one every time a user accessed the resource at the site.

As per claims 26 and 27, Hegli disclosed a timer module keeping track of a

controlled access to the sites by using a time stamp indicating a start time of access to

the web site resources and end point of allowed access by comparing a current time

spent in accessing the site against the allowed time. See Column 17, Lines 43-67.

Hegli disclosed, a cookie analysis module, where a cookie deposited at the client device

was obtained from the client device holding authentication information for the user,

which was compared against the access limit status of the user access record (claims

30-31). See Column 9, Lines 53-67, and Column 16, Line 51 through Column 17, Line

27 and Figures 9 and 10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 2, 13-15,18, 19, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Hegli et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,606,659) hereinafter referred to as

Hegli as applied to claims 1, 12 and 20 above in view of Heinz (U.S. Patent Number

5,812,764).

With respect to the rejection applied above, Hegli further disclosed generating a "unique user ID" (claims 2 and 13, See Figure 9, Step 726). Hegli disclosed a timer monitoring user's access amount and assigning the timer to the requesting user's access, setting a new timer (See Figure 11, step 868) for new user and *incrementing access number* when a user access the site/page according to a preset limit (claim 14). See Figures 4, 11 and 13. Hegli taught assigning unique identification to the user/visitor and logged the identification to the database record of the visitor (claim 15) See Figure 9, Steps 726 and 716.   Hegli disclosed a timer timing the user's access to the controlled sites where the timer was timing the limit against the specified limit for a specific visitor/user of the site (claims 18 and 19, See Figures 4 and 11, Column 9, Lines 30-52). Hegli substantially disclosed the invention as claimed; however, Hegli was silent regarding a password generator and an e-mail server for sending the generated password to the user via e-mail.

However, these features are old and well known in the art, as evidenced by Heinz's teachings with regards to providing a password generator for generating a passwords and an e-mail server for sending the generated passwords or other authentication information to the user via e-mail (See Column 4, Lines 1-65 and Column 8, Lines 14-40). It is respectfully submitted, that it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the teachings of Heinz related to the password generator and an e-mail server and have modified the teachings of Hegli related to controlling access to a web site, because enabling a password generator generating hard to break passwords and sending the passwords to

the requesting clients using a secured e-mail server would provide a better security to the system and the users that depend on it (See ABSTRACT, Column 2, Lines 42-67).

6.   Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hegli et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,606,659) as applied to claims 20 and 31 above, and further in view of what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Hegli taught a cookie analysis module, where a cookie deposited at the client device, obtaining the cookie from the client device holding authentication information for the user, which was compared against the access limit status of the user access record. See Column 9, Lines 53-67, and Column 16, Line 51 through Column 17, Line 27 and Figures 9 and 10. Hegli substantially disclosed the invention as claimed, where the cookie comprised user identification information to access the controlled site. However, Hegli was silent regarding the specific contents comprised with in the cookie (*the access allowance limit for the visitor and the amount visitor has accessed the site*).

An artisan working with the system of Hegli related to limiting access to web sites would have been aware that Cookies are a general mechanism used by server-side applications to store information in individual browsers usually set/deposited by a server on a client device comprising multiple information such as a user name, last-accessed date and other variables which can be retrieved by the server-side application. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate *the access allowance limit for the visitor and the amount visitor has*

accessed the site in the cookie and have modified the teachings of Hegli related to

access control to information on the Internet so that a visitor/client could access his/her

access limit status offline.

Conclusion

7.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

Applicant's disclosure.

        a.   Umbreit, Timothy F. (U.S. Patent Number 6,704,787) Entitled: *Date of birth*

authentication system and method using demographic and/or geographic data

supplied by a subscriber that is verified by a third party

        b.   Carrington, J et al. (U.S. Pre-Published US 20040015586 A) Entitled:

Internet site user access control method involves blocking user access of Internet

site, when access time reaches predetermined value

        c.   Howard, John Hal et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,678,731) Entitled:

Controlling access to a network server using an authentication ticket

        d.   Eichstaedt, Matthias et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,662,230) Entitled:

System and method for dynamically limiting robot access to server data

        e.   Feldman, Daniel J. (U.S. Patent Number 6,654,745) Entitled: *System and*

method for control of access to resources

f.   Howard, John Hal et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,584,505) Entitled:

Authenticating access to a network server without communicating login

information through the network server

g.   Blumenau, Trevor (U.S. Patent Number 6,529,952) Entitled: *Method and*

system for the collection of cookies and other information from a panel

h.   Perlman, Radia J. et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,510,523) Entitled: *Method*

and system for providing limited access privileges with an untrusted terminal

i.   Dorfman, Alexander et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,449,651) Entitled:

System and method for providing temporary remote access to a computer

j.   Melen, Bjorn (U.S. Patent Number 6,412,003) Entitled: *System and a*

method for accessing services

k.   Kobayashi, Yoichi et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,275,825) Entitled: *Data*

access control apparatus for limiting data access in accordance with user

attribute

l.   Skopp, Peter et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,256,739) Entitled: *Method and*

apparatus to determine user identity and limit access to a communications

network

m.   Shannon, Steven (U.S. Patent Number 6,233,618) Entitled: *Access*

control of networked data

n.   Feldman, Daniel J. (U.S. Patent Number 6,154,741) Entitled: *Entitlement*

management and access control system

o.   Pogue, Michael Alan et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,112,240) Entitled: *Web site client information tracker*

p.   Hudson, Jerome D. et al.   (U.S. Patent Number 6,055,637) Entitled: *System and method for accessing enterprise-wide resources by presenting to the resource a temporary credential*

q.   Schmidt, Jonathan et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,991,807) Entitled: *System for controlling users access to a distributive network in accordance with constraints present in common access distributive network interface separate from a server*

r.   Baker, Brenda Sue et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,678,041) Entitled: *System and method for restricting user access rights on the internet based on rating information stored in a relational database*

s.   Oka, Hiroyuki (JP 09006682 A) Entitled: *Data access protection method*

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Yemane Gerezgiher whose telephone number is 703-305-4874. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful. The examiner's supervisor, William Cuchlinski, can be reached at (703) 308-3873.

Yemane M. Gerezgiher
Art Unit 2144

WILLIAM A. CUCHLINSKI, JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600